

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAI‘I

AGE REVERSAL UNITY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT
MANOA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-00275-DKW-RT

**ORDER (1) DENYING
APPLICATIONS TO PROCEED
IN DISTRICT COURT WITHOUT
PREPAYMENT OF FEES AND
COSTS; AND (2) DISMISSING
COMPLAINT¹**

On June 26, 2024, Plaintiff Age Reversal Unity filed a Complaint, alleging that Defendants—several universities and colleges in the State of Hawai‘i²—violated various constitutional rights and committed several state-law torts by “fail[ing] to establish academic programs dedicated to the study and advancement of human immortality.” Dkt. No. 1 at 4. Shortly thereafter, on July 5, 2024, Age Reversal Unity filed two applications to proceed *in forma pauperis*.³ Dkt. Nos. 5 & 6.

¹Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(d), the Court elects to decide these matters without a hearing.

²Defendants include: University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, University of Hawai‘i at Hilo, University of Hawai‘i–West O‘ahu, University of Hawai‘i Maui College, Hawai‘i Pacific University, Chaminade University of Honolulu, Brigham Young University–Hawai‘i, Hawai‘i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kapi‘olani Community College, Kaua‘i Community College, Leeward Community College, and Windward Community College. Dkt. No. 1 at 1.

³Age Reversal Unity filed both the short form, Dkt. No. 5, and long form, Dkt. No. 6, applications.

I. IFP Application

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), federal courts may authorize the commencement of suit without prepayment of fees or securities by a person who submits an affidavit which demonstrates that they lack the ability to pay. This statute, however, does not apply to corporations, partnerships, community associations, or any other entity—rather, “only a natural person may qualify for treatment *in forma pauperis* under § 1915.” *Rowland v. California Men’s Colony, Unit II Men’s Advisory Council*, 506 U.S. 194, 196 (1993). Here, Age Reversal Unity represents that it is “a company dedicated to the advancement of human immortality as a scientific and academic discipline.” Dkt. No. 1 at 9. As such, it is not eligible for *in forma pauperis* status, and its IFP Applications, Dkt. Nos. 5 & 6, are DENIED.

II. Screening

In addition, when a plaintiff files an action *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), the Court subjects it to mandatory screening and may order the dismissal of any claim it determines “is frivolous or malicious; fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Though the Court must liberally construe a *pro se* complaint, *Eldridge v. Block*, 832 F.2d at 1137, the Court cannot act as counsel for a *pro se* litigant, including by providing the

essential elements of a claim. *Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004); *Ivey v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Alaska*, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982).

Importantly, entities, including corporations and other business organizations, cannot appear *pro se* in federal court, but instead must be represented by a licensed attorney. *See Rowland*, 506 U.S. at 202; *see also* LR 81.1(b) (explaining that in the District of Hawai‘i, “[e]ntities other than individuals, including but not limited to corporations, partnerships, limited liability partnerships or corporations, trusts, community associations, and unions, must be represented by an attorney.”). Here, it appears that Age Reversal Unity lacks such representation.⁴ As such, the Complaint must be DISMISSED. *See Quality Pro. Indus., Inc. v. Sun Power*, 2015 WL 12838142, at *1 (D. Haw. Mar. 19, 2015) (explaining that the complaint was subject to dismissal without prejudice where the corporate plaintiff lacked representation by licensed counsel); LR 81.1(a) (warning *pro se* litigants that their cases may be dismissed for failure to comply with the Local Rules).

⁴Although the Complaint is signed and filed by Ali Afshar, it does not appear that Afshar is a licensed attorney in the State of Hawaii. *See* Dkt. No. 1 at 5, 17; *see also* *Member Directory*, HAWAII STATE BAR ASS’N, https://hsba.org/HSBA_2020/For_the_Public/Find_a_Lawyer/HSBA_2020/Public/Find_a_Lawyer.aspx?hkey=5850e9dd-227b-4556-8ec8-cf8878106f77 (enter “Ali” in the “First name” field, “Afshar” in the “Last name” field, and select “Find.”). Moreover, even if Afshar is licensed in another U.S. jurisdiction, there is no indication that he has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in this case. *See* LR 83.1(c)(2).


CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, Age Reversal Unity's IFP Applications, Dkt. Nos. 5 & 6, are DENIED and the Complaint, Dkt. No. 1, is DISMISSED. Should Age Reversal Unity wish to proceed with this case, it must pay the filing fee and have counsel appear by **August 9, 2024**. **The Court cautions Age Reversal Unity that failure to comply with the guidance in this Order by August 9, 2024 will result in the automatic dismissal of this action without prejudice or further notice.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 22, 2024 at Honolulu, Hawai'i.




Derrick K. Watson
Chief United States District Judge

Age Reversal Unity v. University of Hawaii at Manoa, et al; Civil No. 24-00275
DKW-RT; **ORDER (1) DENYING APPLICATIONS TO PROCEED IN
DISTRICT COURT WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF FEES AND COSTS;
AND (2) DISMISSING COMPLAINT**